

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 2—5, 7—8, 16, 19—20, 22—25 and 28 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 6, 21, 26 and 29 are previously presented.

C) Claims 1, 9—15, 18, 30—33 and 35 are currently amended.

D) Claims 17, 27 and 34 are cancelled.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Traversal of the §103 Rejections

Claims 1—17, 18—26, 28—33 and 35 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,677, hereinafter "Wiegley" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,362,879, hereinafter "Berg." In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document file;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file, wherein said controller operates to read quantity permission data from said document file, said quantity permission data specifying a number of copies of said document file authorized to be printed; and
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file;
- wherein said controller operates to control printing of the number of copies authorized to be printed, and after printing the number of copies authorized to be printed of the document file, **automatically deletes said document file from said memory.**

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 The Wiegley and Berg references fail to disclose a controller configured so
2 that it "automatically deletes said document file from said memory". Instead,
3 Wiegley discloses deletion of the session identifier. Accordingly, Wiegley and
4 Berg do not teach or suggest aspects recited by Claim 1.

5 The Patent Office suggests that Wiegley teaches automatic deletion at
6 column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 13. The Applicant respectfully disagrees
7 with this characterization of this passage in Wiegley.

8 In fact, Wiegley teaches that if the session identifier is not changed, then
9 the document is printed and the session identifier is deleted. (See column 2, lines
10 7—13.) Accordingly, Wiegley does not disclose printing the physical (paper)
11 document and deleting the document file from memory. Instead, Wiegley teaches
12 deletion of the session identifier. Thus, the combination of printing and deleting
13 of the document file is not shown by Wiegley, who fails to teach or suggest
14 protecting the client by actual deletion of a valid document file from memory after
15 printing the job. Deletion of the session identifier does not actually remove a valid
16 document from memory.

17 The Patent Office appears to equate deletion of the session key with
18 deletion of the document file. However, the session key and the document file are
19 distinct, as seen in numerous locations in the Wiegley document.

20 Therefore, at least this element recited in the Applicant's Claim 1, as
21 amended, is not disclosed by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant
22 respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 1, as amended, be
23 removed.
24
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 **Claims 2—8** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their
2 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
3 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are
4 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
5 combination with one another.

6 **Claim 9** recites a printer device comprising:

- 7 • a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- 8 • a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document file;
- 9 • a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in
10 said received document file, wherein said controller operates to read
11 a quantity permission data content from said document file, said
12 quantity permission data specifying a number of authorized copies of
13 said document file to be printed; and
- 14 • a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document
15 file, wherein said controller operates to check a unique device
16 identification data contained in said document file with a stored
17 unique device identification data of said printer device, and provided
18 a successful match is found, to print said physical copy of said
19 document file and to delete said document file after printing said
20 physical copy; and
- 21 • if said received unique device identifier differs from said stored
22 unique device identifier data, said controller operates to delete said
23 document file without printing a physical copy of said document file.

24 Claim 9 has been amended to more carefully point out that the quantity data
25 is contained in the document file, and is therefore read from the document file.
This configuration is consistent with the recitations of Claim 27, as originally
filed.

The Berg reference fails to disclose a controller configured to “read a
quantity permission data content from said document file”. Accordingly, Berg
does not teach or suggest aspects recited by Claim 1, wherein the document file
contains the quantity permission data, which is then read by the controller. Such

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 an arrangement allows the user to control the quantity of the copies of the
2 document printed, which is a security feature.

3 Berg teaches that quantity permission data is "in software" (column 2, lines
4 53—56). Additionally, Berg teaches how the system may limit the number of
5 copies the user may print (column 7, lines 5—21). Thus, Berg teaches that the
6 system can limit the number of copies.

7 However, Berg does not teach or suggest allowing the user to limit the
8 number of copies by inserting quantity permission data *into the document file*. In
9 the claim as recited, quantity data in the document file provides a mechanism by
10 which the user may control the number of copies. In contrast, Berg teaches only
11 that the system can control the number of copies. Therefore, Berg fails to teach or
12 suggest a mechanism by which the document file comprising the print job itself
13 can control production of extra copies (which may fall into the wrong hands).
14 That is, Berg teaches that *the system* can control the number of copies printed, but
15 does not teach or suggest that *the document file* (print job) can include data that
16 will control the number of copies made. This is a significant difference, because
17 as Berg points out, the printing system and the user may have different
18 perspectives. (E.g., Berg points out that the printing system can be rented to the
19 user, who then must pay for copies.)

20 The Patent Office suggests that Berg teaches a controller configured to read
21 "a quantity permission data content from said document file". The Applicant
22 respectfully disagrees. Referring to columns 2 and 7 in the passages cited, it is
23 clear that Berg teaches that the system can be configured with quantity data.
24
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 However, the innovation recited in the claim, wherein the quantity data is included
2 within the document file, is not seen.

3 In fact, Berg teaches away from including the quantity data in the document
4 file. This would allow the user (e.g. the sender who configures the document file)
5 to control the quantity. In contrast, at column 7, line 12, Berg teaches that the user
6 can be prevented from controlling the quantity, so that the system can be rented to
7 the user, while keeping control from the user.

8 Accordingly, Berg fails to teach or suggest, reading "a quantity permission
9 data content from said document file". Instead, Berg teaches that the quantity can
10 be controlled by software, and teaches away from letting the user control the
11 quantity by annotation of the document file.

12 Claim 9 also recites, deleting "said document file after printing said
13 physical copy", in a manner similar to that seen in Claim 1. Accordingly, the
14 argument used by the Applicant with respect to Claim 1 is incorporated herein by
15 reference. As seen above, Wiegley teaches deleting the session identifier, but does
16 not teach or suggest deleting a document file after printing.

17 In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited
18 in Claim 9, as amended, is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.
19 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of
20 Claim 9, as amended, be removed.

21 Claim 10 recites a system configured for sending secure encrypted
22 document files, said system comprising:

- 23 • a data processor;
- 24 • a memory;
- 25 • an encryption algorithm capable of encrypting a document file;
- a device selector for selecting a said uniquely identifiable recipient device;

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

- a file selector for selecting a document file;
- a stored list of a set of authorized recipient devices, each said recipient device identified by a unique device identifier data inaccessibly embedded within said computer entity.
- wherein said computer entity operates to:
 - select at least one document file, wherein the selected document file comprises **quantity permission data specifying a number of copies of said document file authorized to be printed;**
 - select at least one said uniquely identifiable recipient device to send said document to;
 - encrypt said document files; and
 - address said at least one document file to said selected uniquely identified recipient device; and
- a user interface capable of displaying a history list of document files sent, said history list comprising:
 - data describing a document file sent;
 - data describing at least one said recipient device to which said document file has been sent;
 - data describing a number of copies of documents said recipient device is authorized to print from said received document file; and
- at least one recipient printer device, said recipient printer device capable of receiving an encrypted document file, establishing that said encrypted document file is intended for said recipient printer device, decrypting and printing said encrypted document file, and **automatically deleting said document file after printing a physical copy of a document from said document file.**

Claim 10 has been amended to recite a document file comprising quantity permission data. Accordingly, Claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 9 is allowable, and the remarks with respect to Claim 9 are incorporated herein by reference.

Claim 10 has also been amended to recite automatic deletion of the document file. Accordingly, Claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons Claims 1 and 9 are allowable, and the remarks with respect to these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 Therefore, Claim 10, as amended, is not taught or suggested by the prior art
2 of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to
3 Claim 10, as amended, be removed.

4
5 Claims 11—14 depend from Claim 10 and are allowable due to their
6 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
7 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 10, are
8 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
9 combination with one another.

10 Claim 15 recites a distributed secure document printing system, said
11 system comprising:

- 12 • at least one sending computer entity, capable of sending an
13 encrypted electronic document file, said document file having an
14 encrypted data content, and a unique device identifier data
15 identifying a recipient printer device to which said document file is
16 intended to be printed by; and
- 17 • at least one recipient printer device, said recipient printer device
18 capable of receiving said encrypted document file, establishing that
19 said document file is intended for said recipient printer device,
20 decrypting and printing said document file, and **automatically
21 deleting said electronic document file after printing a physical
22 copy of a document from said document file;**
- 23 • wherein said recipient printer device is configured to send a
24 confirmation message back to said sending computer entity,
25 confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of
a specified permitted number of copies of said document file,
wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said
document file is contained within the document file.

22 Claim 15, as amended, recites, “automatically deleting said electronic
23 document file after printing a physical copy of a document from said document
24 file” and “wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 is contained within the document file". These elements were recited in at least
2 original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

3 Therefore, Claim 15 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above
4 with respect to earlier numbered claims. Accordingly, the remarks associated with
5 these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

6 Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant's Claim 15, as
7 amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the
8 Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 15, as amended, be
9 removed.

10 Claim 16 depends from Claim 15 and is allowable due to its dependence
11 from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited
12 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 15, are neither disclosed
13 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one
14 another.

15
16 Claim 18 recites a method of securely communicating an electronic
document file over a network, said method comprising the steps of:

- 17 • encrypting said document file;
- 18 • specifying a recipient device for sending said document file to, said
recipient device being uniquely identifiable by a unique device
19 identifier data;
- 20 • attaching said unique identifier data to said document file;
- 21 • sending said document file in encrypted format to said intended
recipient device;
- 22 • receiving said transmitted document file and decrypting said
document file;
- 23 • reading said unique device identifier data of said document file.
- 24 • if said unique device identifier data of said document file
corresponds to a unique device identifier data of said recipient
25 device, printing a physical copy of said document file and
automatically deleting said document file;

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

- if said unique device identifier data of said document file does not correspond with said unique device identifier data of said recipient device, deleting said received document file without printing a physical copy of said document file; and
- sending, from said recipient device, a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, **wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file.**

Claim 18, as amended, recites, “automatically deleting said electronic document file after printing a physical copy of a document from said document file” and “wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file”. These elements were recited in at least original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

Therefore, Claim 18 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to earlier numbered claims, including Claim 1, Claim 9 and others. Accordingly, the remarks associated with these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant’s Claim 18, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 18, as amended, be removed.

Claims 19—20 depend from Claim 18 and are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 18, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 **Claim 21** recites a method of secure printing of a received document file,
2 said method comprising the steps of:

- 3 • receiving said document file in encrypted format at a receiving device;
- 4 • decrypting said document file;
- 5 • reading a unique device identifier data identifying a recipient device for which said document file is intended;
- 6 • comparing said unique device identifier data with a locally stored device identifier data stored at said receiving device;
- 7 • if said received unique device identifier data corresponds with said locally stored device identifier data, printing at least one physical copy of said document file and **automatically deleting said document file**;
- 8 • if said received unique device identifier data differs from said stored unique device identifier data, deleting said document file; and
- 9 • sending, from said recipient device, a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, **wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file.**

14 Claim 21, as amended, recites, “automatically deleting said electronic
15 document file after printing a physical copy of a document from said document
16 file” and “wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file
17 is contained within the document file”. These elements were recited in at least
18 original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

19 Therefore, Claim 21 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above
20 with respect to earlier numbered claims. Accordingly, the remarks associated with
21 these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

22 Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant’s Claim 21, as
23 amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the
24
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 21, as amended, be removed.

Claims 22—25 depend from Claim 21 and are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 21, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 26 recites a method of sending a document file for printing by a specified authorized recipient printing device, said method comprising the steps of:

- selecting a content of said document file;
- encrypting said content;
- attaching a unique device identifier data, identifying a recipient device to which said document file is to be sent;
- sending said document file to said recipient device; and
- **adding a permitted quantity data to said document file, said permitted quantity data specifying a permitted number of copies of said document file which can be printed.**

Claim 26 was previously amended to include a version of elements originally recited in Claim 27, as seen in bold, above.

Claim 26 has been amended to recite a document file comprising quantity permission data. Accordingly, Claim 26 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 9 is allowable, and the remarks with respect to Claim 9 are incorporated herein by reference.

The Patent Office suggests that, "...it is obvious to modify the teachings of Wiegley so that the owner of the content can collect royalties for a user printing their content as disclosed by Berg et al." Thus, the Patent Office contemplates

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 Therefore, at least this element recited in the Applicant's Claim 26, as
2 amended, is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the
3 Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 26, as amended, be
4 removed.

5 Claim 28 depends from Claim 26 and is allowable due to its dependence
6 from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited
7 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 26, are neither disclosed
8 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one
9 another.

10 Claim 29 recites a computer entity comprising a data processor, a data
11 storage device, a printer port, and having an attached printer device, said computer
12 entity comprising:

- 13 • a module for decrypting an encrypted document file;
- 14 • a unique device identifier for identifying said computer entity;
- 15 • wherein said computer entity operates to:
 - 16 • receive a document file in encrypted format;
 - 17 • decrypt said document;
 - 18 • extract a unique device identifier data from said document;
 - 19 • compare said extracted unique identifier data with said unique
20 device identifier of said computer entity;
 - 21 • if a match is found between said received unique device
22 identifier data of said document and said unique identifier of said
23 computer entity, send a said document file for printing by said
24 attached printer device; and
 - 25 • after sending said document to said printer device, delete said
document file from said computer entity; and
- adding a permitted quantity data to said document file, said
permitted quantity data specifying a permitted number of copies
of said document file which can be printed.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 Claim 29 has also been amended to recite automatic deletion of the
2 document file. Accordingly, Claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons Claims
3 1 and 9 are allowable, and the remarks with respect to these claims are
4 incorporated herein by reference.

5 Claim 29 has been amended to recite a document file comprising quantity
6 permission data. Accordingly, Claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim
7 9 is allowable, and the remarks with respect to Claim 9 are incorporated herein by
8 reference.

9 Therefore, Claim 29, as amended, is not taught or suggested by the prior art
10 of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to
11 Claim 29, as amended, be removed.

12 **Claim 30** recites a method of secure printing of a received document file,
13 said method comprising the steps of:

- 14 • receiving said document file in encrypted format;
- 15 • reading a unique device identifier data identifying a recipient device
16 for which said document file is intended;
- 17 • comparing said unique device identifier data with a locally stored
18 identifier data corresponding to a local computer entity device;
- 19 • if said locally stored identifier data differs from said unique device
20 identifier data identifying said recipient device for which said
21 document file is intended, deleting said document file without
22 printing any physical copies of said document file; and
- 23 • printing a number of physical copies of said document file,
24 corresponding to a permitted quantity defined in said document file,
25 wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said
document file is contained within the document file and wherein
said document file is automatically deleted.

22 Claim 30, as amended, recites, "wherein said document file is automatically
23 deleted" and "wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document
24
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 file is contained within the document file". These elements were recited in at least
2 original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

3 Therefore, Claim 30 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above
4 with respect to earlier numbered claims, including Claim 1, Claim 9 and others.
5 Accordingly, the remarks associated with these claims are incorporated herein by
6 reference.

7 Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant's Claim 30, as
8 amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the
9 Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 30, as amended, be
10 removed.

11 **Claim 31** recites a method of secure printing of a received document file,
12 said method comprising the steps of:

- 13 • receiving said document file in encrypted format;
- 14 • reading a unique device identifier data identifying a recipient device
15 for which said document file is intended;
- 16 • comparing said unique device identifier data with a locally stored
17 device identifier data;
- 18 • **reading a permitted quantity data describing a permitted
19 quantity of copies from said document file;**
- 20 • if said received unique device identifier data corresponds with said
21 locally stored device identifier data, printing said permitted quantity
22 of copies of said document file **and automatically deleting said
23 document file;** and
- 24 • printing a number of physical copies of said document file,
25 corresponding to a permitted quantity defined in said document file.

21 Claim 31, as amended, recites, "reading a permitted quantity data
22 describing a permitted quantity of copies from said document file" and
23 "automatically deleting said document file". These elements were recited in at
24 least original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

Therefore, Claim 31 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to earlier numbered claims, including Claim 1, Claim 9 and others. Accordingly, the remarks associated with these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant's Claim 31, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 31, as amended, be removed.

Claim 32 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document file;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file and **automatically deleting said document file**; and
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file,
- wherein said printer device locally stores a decryption key for operating said decryption algorithm to decrypt said received document file; and
- wherein said printer device is configured to send a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, **wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file.**

Claim 32, as amended, recites, "automatically deleting said document file" and "wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file". These elements were recited in at least original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

Therefore, Claim 32 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to earlier numbered claims, including Claim 1, Claim 9 and others. Accordingly, the remarks associated with these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant's Claim 32, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 32, as amended, be removed.

Claim 33 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving a digital document file;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file; and
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file,
- wherein said controller operates to compare a received unique identifier data contained in said received document file with a locally stored unique device identifier data stored at said printer device and operates to control printing of a predetermined quantity of said physical copy, **wherein said predetermined quantity is specified in said received document file;**
- if said received unique identifier data matches said stored unique device identifier, control printing of at least one said physical copy of said document file and **automatically delete said document file;** and
- if said received unique identifier data contained the said received document file does not match said stored unique device identifier data, to inhibit printing of any physical copies of said document file.

Claim 33, as amended, recites, "wherein said predetermined quantity is specified in said received document file" and "automatically delete said document file". These elements were recited in at least original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

Therefore, Claim 33 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to earlier numbered claims, including Claim 1, Claim 9 and others. Accordingly, the remarks associated with these claims are incorporated herein by reference.

Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant's Claim 33, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 33, as amended, be removed.

Claim 35 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document files; a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file;
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file,
- wherein a decryption key is stored locally in said printer device for operating said decryption algorithm to decrypt said received document files;
- said controller operates to compare a received unique identifier data contained in said received document file with a locally stored unique device identifier data stored at said printer device;
- if said received unique identifier data matches said stored unique device identifier, control printing of at least one said physical copy of said document file and **automatically deleting said document file**; and
- if said received unique identifier data contained the said received document file does not match said stored unique device identifier data, to inhibit decryption of said document file and inhibit printing of any physical copies of said document file;
- wherein said printer device is configured to send a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, **wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within said document file.**

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

1 Claim 35, as amended, recites, "automatically deleting said document file"
2 and "wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is
3 contained within said document file". These elements were recited in at least
4 original Claims 1 and 27, respectively.

5 Therefore, Claim 35 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above
6 with respect to earlier numbered claims, including Claim 1, Claim 9 and others.
7 Accordingly, the remarks associated with these claims are incorporated herein by
8 reference.

9 Therefore, at least these elements, recited in the Applicant's Claim 35, as
10 amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the
11 Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 35, as amended, be
12 removed.

13 **Conclusion**

14 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
15 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's
16 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the
17 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the
18 purpose of scheduling an interview.

19 Respectfully Submitted,

20 Dated: 14 June 2006

21 By: 

22 David S. Thompson
23 Reg. No. 37,954
24 Attorney for Applicant

25 LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 03/14/2006

Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25